

Aberystwyth University

Patriotic women

Marshall, Louise

Published in:
History of European Ideas

DOI:
[10.1016/j.histeuroideas.2003.11.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.histeuroideas.2003.11.014)

Publication date:
2005

Citation for published version (APA):
Marshall, L. (2005). Patriotic women: Shakespearean heroines of the 1720s. *History of European Ideas*, 31(2), 289-298. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.histeuroideas.2003.11.014>

Document License CC BY-NC-ND

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Aberystwyth Research Portal (the Institutional Repository) are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Aberystwyth Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Aberystwyth Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

tel: +44 1970 62 2400
email: is@aber.ac.uk

Patriotic women: Shakespearean heroines of the 1720s

Louise Marshall

Abstract

This paper discusses three adaptations of Shakespeare's history plays written during the 1720s. These texts, I contend, counter claims that positive representations of women during this period were confined to the domestic sphere. In these plays women are active participants in the public realm of politics and commerce. The heroines of Ambrose Philips' *Humfrey Duke of Gloucester* (1723), Aaron Hill's *King Henry the Fifth* (1723) and Theophilus Cibber's *King Henry the Sixth* (1724), rather than being driven by love and domestic duty, act on political motivation. Patriotism, which characterises these women, is the primary political slogan of all three plays. These female protagonists exemplify the value of a patriotic political conduct that crosses party lines. Their unpartisan or universal brand of patriotism anticipates the opposition views expressed by Bolingbroke in the following decade. This paper also addresses the broad consensus amongst Feminist critics that women in adaptations of Shakespeare provide little more than mere 'breeches roles' titillation. The histories of Philips, Hill and Cibber represent heroines who, no less than their male counterparts, exercise control during political crises. These women are not objects of titillation but subjects for emulation.

'Is Fortitude and Wisdom,

Given to Man Alone?'¹

Early 18th-century adaptations of Shakespeare can arguably be regarded as reconstructions of the plays for the 'modern' stage. Commentators such as Jean Marsden have convincingly suggested that post-1660 drama turns its attention to love, family and marriage, all subjects befitting the presence of women on stage.² Such commentaries suggest that a specific role is defined for actresses in the plays of this period. Marsden has asserted that developments in women's theatrical employment are 'closely linked to the definition of women as inhabitants of the private or domestic sphere and their exclusion from the public world of politics and commerce'.³ On stage, she suggests, women are precluded from participating in the male-dominated world of politics. However, this argument ignores the presence of a large number of queens in late seventeenth-century drama. This increase in the number of high profile political roles for women can be attributed in part to the growing number of

actresses post-restoration, but may also be seen as a reflection of the contemporary political climate. Did the successive reigns of Mary II and Anne influence dramatic representations of politically powerful women? This essay will challenge the assumption that dramatic representations of women by default follow Marsden's model of gender-based political exclusion.

Three adaptations of Shakespearean history plays from the 1720s will serve to challenge this assumption.⁴ All staged at Drury Lane, Ambrose Philips' *Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester* premièred on 15 February 1723; Aaron Hill's *King Henry V* premièred on 5 December 1723 and Theophilus Cibber's *Henry VI* premièred on 3 July.⁵ All three plays present enlightened women characters who demonstrate patriotism and participate overtly in politics. My intention is to examine the role of women in these plays in relation to the developing arena of patriot politics and thus challenge existing feminist readings of early eighteenth-century adaptations of Shakespeare. I also wish to examine the political allegiances of these plays. Critics such as Christine Gerrard, Bertrand A. Goldgar and Alexander Pettit have identified opposition patriot polemics as a powerful literary assault on the Walpole administration. Does patriotism necessarily mean opposition? Are any of these plays examples of pro-Walpolean patriotic literature?

The concept of 'updating' Shakespeare to comment on contemporary political events was a recurrent concern of eighteenth-century literary theory.⁶ As the century progressed, Shakespeare came to represent 'English Liberty' and a resistance to neo-classical rules and decorum.⁷ Do adapters therefore extend this 'resistance' to the representation of women within their plays? Commentators such as Elizabeth Montagu whose *An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Shakespeare* (1796) devotes a whole chapter to 'the historical drama', makes claims for Shakespeare as a moral philosopher. Montagu suggests that the history plays are 'excellently calculated to correct'.⁸ History is representative of the manners of the times and the characters of the most illustrious persons concerned in a series of important events. In terms of eighteenth-century literary theory, the history play provides an ideal vehicle for political comment and more importantly political, not just moral, correction.

Philips' *Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester*, Hill's *King Henry V* and Cibber's *Henry VI* are part of a developing debate about patriotism. The origins of this debate, which lead to Bolingbroke's patriot ideology of the 1730s, can be traced back to the contract theories of Hobbes and Locke. Hobbesian ideas of acceptable degrees of political self-interest, which only become unacceptable when 'natural law' is transgressed, were rejected in early models of patriotism.

⁹ Patriotism as a political slogan first appeared in England in the 1720s.¹⁰ At this time the

patriots' primary characteristic was the rejection of political self-interest. For this reason patriotism is widely seen as a weapon for opposition politics. My contention is that patriotism was a shared rhetoric, employed by each party to put the other down. As a device for self-promotion, patriotism was frequently cited for the negative connotations of un-patriotic behaviour, becoming what J.G.A. Pocock terms 'a rhetoric that outsiders use to comment on insiders and how the latter keep them out'.¹¹ Brean Hammond has noted that 'the opponent of government was either a "Patriot" selflessly acting in his country's interest, or he was a factionalist and a danger to the body politic'.¹² The three adaptations I am concerned with demonstrate an extension of this definition. Opponents of the government may be either patriots, acting in the country's interest, or factionalists, acting in their own interests, but so may members of the government itself. I shall also suggest that women are portrayed both as active opponents and supporters of government and, in common with their male counterparts, they adopt patriot or factionalist agendas as independent political activists. I am suggesting therefore that these plays offer a representation of political patriotism which has a more universal application than Bolingbroke's restrictive oppositional rhetoric. If, as Alexander Pettit has argued, Gay's *Beggar's Opera* (1728) is to serve as the *terminus a quo* of the use of Bolingbrokean polemics in drama, it follows that prior to this time, the polemics of patriotism must have had a significantly different connotation.¹³ John Loftis attempts to elucidate patriotism pre-1728 with specific reference to adaptations of Shakespeare, claiming that as *all* such plays depict faction and uprising there is a clear relationship between adaptation and the fear of Jacobite Rebellion. This of course suggests that *all* adaptations of Shakespeare are anti-Jacobite, by association anti-Tory, and thus a form of government propaganda. There seems to be no 'middle ground' in contemporary criticism for a less dogmatic representation of early eighteenth-century patriot polemics.

The three plays I have chosen to focus on demonstrate the need to adopt a less partisan view of early patriot literature. Women's theatrical roles and patriot rhetoric are linked in these plays by their divergence from their conventional perceptions. J.G.A. Pocock identifies a link between the creation of a Whig opposition, a political alienation caused by the creation of Walpole's Whig oligarchy, and literary fears for the loss of 'modern virtues of clarity, order and good taste'. Concern for the decline in 'ancient and Roman virtues of political independence, liberty and self-mastery' suggests an artistic patriot polemic that is not overtly partisan.¹⁴ Clearly it is possible to attribute such vague terms as 'ancient virtue' and 'self-mastery' to members of either political party. This dualistic application can be observed in Ambrose Philips' dedication of *Humfrey Duke of Gloucester* to William Pulteney:

It is the Happiness of England, that, in the Age wherein You flourish, the nobles enjoy all their valuable Privileges; and yet, the Commons are neither Poor, nor Distrest: Whereby Liberty and Property become universal in Great Britain; the Government acquires a double Support; and every Representative of the People has yearly Opportunities to distinguish Himself as a Patriot!¹⁵

Philips urges 'every representative of the people' to adopt a patriotic stance, to follow the example of his hero and protect Britain's liberty. This dedication was written whilst Pulteney was chairman of the Committee of Inquiry into the Atterbury Affair. Philips' play is clearly pro-Walpole. First performed in 1723 when Bishop Atterbury's arrest and exile were common fodder for the gossip columns and newspapers of the Town, *Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester* supports not only Walpole's government but also this public demonstration of what Katherine West Scheil describes as 'the need to maintain control of disruptive social influences'.¹⁶ His pro-Walpolean exaltation is, however, overtly couched in the language of patriotism.¹⁷ The evil Cardinal Beaufort, a maleficent version of Atterbury, echoes Pocock's words; 'The free, stubborn, Spirits of the *English!*/Tenacious of their ancient Rights and Customs,/They will not be Controll'd, but by their laws:/Nor, is the King without his Parliament, secure'.¹⁸ Beaufort and the Queen's supporters are the 'Other', the un-patriotic, the non-English and it is the 'ancient virtues of liberty and self-mastery' that thwart Beaufort's plans and ultimately lead to his agonising death. Beaufort is racked by guilt for the murder of his nephew and dies without absolution for his sins. Gloucester, leader of the 'Band of Patriots',¹⁹ dies a hero's death, murdered by his enemy whilst fighting for the idealised dream of his fellow patriots:

The happy Day,

When *Rome*, no more, usurps Tyrannic Sway!-

Or, That deny'd; may our Descendants see

The Land throughout, from Superstition free:

With Kings who fill an independent Throne,

And know no Power Supreme beside their Own!²⁰

This Protestant utopia is clearly Hanoverian and supports the government's stance against the Jacobite traitor Atterbury who threatens this ideal. However, the last lines of this vision suggest a need to curb Walpole's increasing power within the government. Philips desires,

'Kings who fill an independent Throne,/And know no Power Supreme beside their Own.' Hanoverian rule and thus, by implication, the presiding Whig government are clearly preferred to the Tory and Jacobite alternative, but power must remain in the care of an independent patriot and not become the province of a self-interested minister.

Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester is clearly a Whig patriot and demonstrates the appropriation of patriot polemics by pro-government literature. But how are women patriots represented in relation to politics? Jean I. Marsden describes women in adaptations of Shakespeare as 'paragons of domestic virtue' who 'support England by supporting their fathers', and who, by doing so reinforce 'the hierarchical structure of the family and by extension the basis of patriarchal society'.²¹ Family, however, is not the primary concern of women such as Catherine in Aaron Hill's *Henry V*. For the patriotic women of these histories, the welfare of the state is of more significance than filial obedience or wifely duty. Catherine angrily objects when her father commands her to marry Henry in an attempt to secure peace between England and France: 'Let that Duty, which I owe my Country/Inspire me to confess, what fix'd Aversion/What rooted Hatred, Nature bids me bear/To Him of all Mankind, the most abhorr'd'.²² Her primary 'duty' is to her country, not to her father. When she finally comes to admire Henry for his valour and patriotic virtue, she turns against her brother and not her country. The Dauphin's plan to murder the English King is foiled by his sister:

I will prevent it—

Ages to come, when they shall hear, the Fame

Of my just Act shall bless my living Name:

What, tho' his Arms my Country's Peace oppose?

All, who hate Treason, and Strike gen'rous Blows,

Shall praise this Deed, which I to Honour owe.²³

Catherine sees her family's honour as inextricably linked with that of her country. Her brother's plot is treacherous; only a military victory secured by patriotic duty can lead to an honourable conclusion to Henry's invasion of France. Political manipulation through marriage or murder can only reinforce France's inferiority to England. To term her 'a paragon of domestic virtue' does not describe Catherine with any accuracy. Nor does it prove an adequate assessment of Philips' Lady Eleanor or Cibber's Lady Grey. All of these women privilege country over family. Eleanor endures public humiliation, preferring to be paraded

through London as a witch than become 'the Cause of civil discord!'.²⁴ Lady Grey initially refuses her King's offer of marriage to secure the welfare of her children on the grounds that, 'You mean Dishonour to yourself;/I am as much unworthy to be Queen/As I'm above serving an ill Design'.²⁵ Her eventual marriage to Edward does not negate this sense of patriotic duty. As civil war erupts the Queen acts to protect their son and future heir to England's throne.

Marsden's discussion further devalues the role of women in these adaptations by reducing Harriet in Hill's *Henry V* to an irrelevant 'breeches role':

While the numerous breeches roles in Shakespeare's original plays allowed boy actors to play more realistic parts, the popularity of these roles in the Restoration and eighteenth century is clearly due to the opportunity they gave of showing off a well-turned feminine ankle.²⁶

Harriet in fact embodies a combination of the patriotic and the un-patriotic woman. Her political treason in participating in the Dauphin's plot to murder her ex-lover Henry demonstrates clearly the ability of women to act contrary to the rules of patriotic behaviour. Harriet is consequently able to participate in politics to the possible detriment of her country. However, she commits what is ultimately the most patriotic act of the entire play. In killing herself, she frees Henry to create an 'independent throne.' His assertion that 'Kings must have no Wishes for themselves!/We are our People's Properties! Our Cares/Must rise above our Passions! The public Eye/Shou'd mark no Fault on Monarchs' is secured by her death.²⁷ Harriet makes Henry truly independent and teaches him that his duty to his country is as that to his lover: 'If my Death can free my dear-lov'd Country/From any Deep Distress, my Life might cause her,/Oh then! Accept Me, as my Subjects Sacrifice'.²⁸ Breeches roles do of course provide titillation, but Marsden's appraisal of Harriet is reductive and inadequate. Harriet fills a gap in Shakespeare's original history. Hill creates a politically active anti-heroine whose role as the un-patriotic woman contrasts with Catherine. Whilst Catherine exhibits a patriotism which obscures her nationality and allows her to become Henry's Queen, Harriet's final act epitomises the English patriot. During the course of the play, the starkly un-patriotic Harriet becomes the self-sacrificing heroine who Catherine, as a future English Queen, must emulate.

The politically active un-patriotic woman can also be seen in Philips' and Cibber's representations of Queen Margaret. For Philips, Margaret acts as the antithesis of Eleanor.

She is driven by self-interest: '*Henry* is beset with Priests and Sycophants;/And that imperious *Margaret* wrests the Sceptre,/From his weak Hand, employ'd to finger Beads'.²⁹ Unlike Eleanor's, the Queen's concern is for her own advancement. She has no concern for the well-being of King and country. In a speech that contrasts sharply with Catherine's dedication to honour in *Henry V*, Margaret offers a vainglorious vision of her future:

Is Fortitude, and Wisdom,
Given to Man Alone?—Prove me, in Council;
Prove me, in the Field!—In Policy, let *Salisbury*,
In War, let *York*, oppose me.—But, my Lords;
Be sure you over-match this slighted Woman!—
Urge me to all Extremes!—Friendship and Favour,
I neither ask nor grant.—Success is Mine:
If Courage claims Success!—Yet if We fail;
Your Chronicles Shall witness to my Fame;
Your Daughters boast, your Sons all emulate,
A Woman's Glory; and the World avow,
England, once, had a Queen deserv'd to reign!³⁰

Margaret's words portend the conflict that is to come in *Henry VI* (Part 3) the historic events of regicide and civil disorder that Philips chooses not to portray, preferring rather to leave his audience with a vision of a political future governed by the rules of patriotism. Margaret's claim is of course denied historically and her imagined place in England's chronicles is supplanted by the more appropriately Protestant Queen of fortitude and wisdom, Elizabeth I. Cibber's Margaret embodies the battle-hungry self-interested woman hinted at by Philips at the end of *Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester*. Margaret again controls and turns her forces against a weak-willed King. Although Cibber's adaptation varies little from Shakespeare's original *Henry VI* (Parts 2&3), he emphasises Margaret's monstrous nature.³¹ She taunts York with the body of Rutland, wiping his tears with his son's blood, she is the 'She Wolf of France' and the 'false French Woman.' Her nationality and her failure to adopt the patriotic behaviour demanded of a Queen of England contrast with the politically less active but preferable Lady Grey.

Feminist readings of these adaptations, such as those offered by Schiel and Marsden, assert that 'women have no power beyond the masochistic ability to arouse sympathy by their suffering'.³² Women's role is simply to reinforce an oppressive patriarchal system. These three adaptations however do not follow this pattern. Women are shown to be politically active; their power is constrained by social hierarchy, not gender restrictions. They operate in the same political sphere as their husbands, fathers and brothers and their political achievements are judged by the same value system, patriotism. Where Marsden argues that adaptations of Shakespeare's histories focus on a love interest, often creating a romantic liaison completely alien to the original text in order to shift value onto the domestic realm of marriage, love and family, I contend that these three adaptations generate women characters who give a political credence to patriotism that operates beyond the realm of historical masculine heroes.³³ As in the case of Cibber's Lady Anne and Lady Elizabeth, women characters presented as apolitical, their presence serves to highlight the patriotic behaviour of other women within the play, in this instance that of Lady Grey.

What, then, are the implications of this politicisation of women's roles in these adaptations? It is important to note that these women are not criticised for their political involvement. This lack of criticism is not confined to the texts themselves, but is also characteristic of contemporary critical comment. For example, in the anonymous poem 'To Mr Philips, on his *Humphrey Duke of Gloucester*, by a Gentleman of the House of Commons', even Margaret is not criticised for her political involvement and is instead pardoned as a victim of Beaufort's manipulation; 'When *France* and *Rome* mislead the reigning Queen,/Feign both would guess at him behind the Scene'.³⁴ If women's participation in politics is more than 'simply an extension of their domestic function' as dutiful daughters and wives, what is the effect of creating explicitly political roles for women and, more importantly, specifically patriotic roles?

³⁵

An examination of eighteenth-century theories of spectatorship may suggest an answer to this question. As Marsden has recently argued with relation to Jeremy Collier and the anti-theatrical debate, a shift in emphasis away from the actor to the spectator became the central focus for early eighteenth-century writing for the stage.³⁶ Anti-theatre theorists suggested that the act of spectatorship associates audience and dramatised action, thus prompting the spectator to re-enact similar modes of conduct.³⁷ Could we therefore infer that in dramatising acts of overt political patriotism by women, dramatists were enticing their female audience to participate in patriotic politics? Marsden's interpretation of the anti-theatrical debate suggests that:

In England a woman can go to theater and see versions of herself represented on stage. Responding to these images, her gaze excites desire which can perhaps be too easily satisfied. Thus through the visual medium of the playhouse, the lady is transformed into the whore.³⁸

When related to patriot politics this would imply that the lady is transformed into a political patriot. This of course pursues the argument too far. It is unlikely that Philips, Hill and Cibber intended to transform their female audiences into patriotic political activists. However, is there evidence in the plays themselves that female spectatorship is linked to the political didacticism of the historical adaptation?

In all three adaptations sexual behaviour is a clear identifier of a woman's value and is closely linked to her patriotic worth. If 'modesty characterises the female sex, "immodesty" represents something gone badly awry, something unnatural'.³⁹ Both Cibber's and Philips's versions of Queen Margaret portray her sexual relationship with the Duke of Suffolk, and in both plays Margaret is shown to be unnatural. Hill introduces Harriet whose previous sexual relations with Henry make her unnatural enough or un-patriotic enough to agree to assassinate her monarch. Harriet's love for Henry prevents her from carrying out the deed and leads her to a patriotic death. Female promiscuity can therefore be related to un-patriotic behaviour in these plays. It is not, however, sexual libertinism that forms the didactic focus; rather, sexual practice acts as a re-enforcement of the high value placed on acts of patriotism. In terms of spectatorship, 'it is the fictional representation [of sexual practices] which constitutes the danger because ... ladies in the audience will identify with the character on the stage, not with the actual actress'.⁴⁰ Therefore as all of the female characters on stage in these history-plays are aristocratic, and as the sexual behaviour of lower-class women has no political implications, it follows that the sexually profligate un-patriotic woman signifies the political 'other', the antithesis of political orthodoxy.⁴¹ It is clear that women in the audience who identify with the character on the stage, will not align themselves with this unorthodox other, whatever their personal political allegiance. These politically enlightened 'Shakespearean' heroines are developed to portray a universal patriotism, a patriotism which crosses the boundaries of party politics and represents idealised political progenitors:

If, to be zealous in the Search of Truth;

If, to abhor foul errors be a Crime;

Then, is my heavy Condemnation just...
 ...This shameful Penance
 Will turn, hereafter, to our lasting Praise;
 When Men shall speak of Eleanor's Submission,
 And Gloucester's brave Forbearance!—Both alike,
 Preferring *England's* Quiet to their Own!⁴²

The adaptations show a literary anticipation and rejection of Bolingbroke's more limiting opposition patriot ideology. Hill, Philips and Cibber extend their representations of patriotism beyond what was to become the predominant political rhetoric. In their adaptations patriotism is not watered down by the 'domestic home-and-hearth moral values' of Bolingbroke's political philosophy.⁴³

¹ Aaron Hill. *King Henry V.* (London: W. Chetwood, 1723). Act V, p. 81.

² See Jean I. Marsden. "Re-written Women: Shakespearean Heroines in the Restoration" *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth*. Ed. Jean I. Marsden. (Hemel Hempsted: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991) 43; see also Christine Gerrard. *The Patriot Opposition to Walpole: Politics Poetry and the National Myth 1725–1742* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994) and Katherine West Scheil, "Early Georgian Politics and Shakespeare: The Black Act and Charles Johnson's *Love in a Forest* (1723)." *Shakespeare Survey* 51: (1998): 45–56.

³ Jean I. Marsden. "Re-written Women: Shakespearean Heroines in the Restoration." *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth*. Ed. Jean I. Marsden. (Hemel Hempsted: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991) 43.

⁴ During the period 1719 to 1745 fifteen adaptations of Shakespeare plays were premièred in London: John Dennis *The Invader of his Country* (1719); Lewis Theobald, *King Richard the Third* (1719); Charles Molloy, *The Half Pay Officers* (1720); Lewis Theobald, *The Tragedy of King Richard II* (1720); Thomas Betterton, *The Sequel to King Henry the Fourth* (1721); Aaron Hill, *King Henry the Fifth; or, The Conquest of France by the English* (1723); Ambrose Phillips, *Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester* (1723); Theophilus Cibber, *King Henry VI*

(1724); Unknown, *The History of King Henry VIII and Anna Bullen* (1732); Unknown, *The History of King John* (1736); Colley Cibber, *Papal Tyranny in the Reign of King John* (1745). Of these, eleven were adaptations of the history plays, nine of which became repertory pieces.

⁵ For further details regarding the performance histories of these plays see Scouten et al. (Eds.). *The London Stage 1660–1800*. (Carbondale: Illinois University Press, 1960–1962) Part II, vol. II and Part III, vol. I.

⁶ For an interesting ‘overview’ of Eighteenth-century criticism and theory concerning Shakespeare and the adaptation of his plays for the ‘modern’ stage, see Catherine M. S. Alexander. “Shakespeare and the Eighteenth Century: Criticism and Research.” *Shakespeare Survey* 51: (1998): 1–15.

⁷ Jean I. Marsden. “Daddy's Girls: Shakespearian Daughters and Eighteenth-Century Ideology.” *Shakespeare Survey* 51: (1998): p. 17.

⁸ Elizabeth Montagu. *An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Shakespeare*. (New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1970) 58.

⁹ See Thomas Hobbes. *Leviathan*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998) Part I, Chapters X–XII.

¹⁰ David Armitage. “A Patriot for Whom? The Afterlives of Bolingbroke's Patriot King.” *Journal of British Studies* 36: (1997): 397.

¹¹ J.G.A. Pocock. *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 245.

¹² Brean S. Hammond. *Pope and Bolingbroke: A Study of Friendship and Influence*. (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984) 127.

¹³ Alexander Pettit. *Illusory Consensus: Bolingbroke and the Polemical Response to Walpole 1730–1737*. (London: University of Delaware Press, 1997) 165–166.

¹⁴ J.G.A. Pocock. *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 247.

¹⁵ Ambrose Phillips. *Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester*. (London: J. Roberts, 1723) i.

¹⁶ Katherine West Scheil. "Early Georgian Politics and Shakespeare: The Black Act and Charles Johnson's *Love in a Forest* (1723)." *Shakespeare Survey* 51: (1998): 51.

¹⁷ The political analogy is explored further in Bertrand A. Goldgar. *Walpole and the Wits: The Relation of Politics to Literature*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1976) 32.

¹⁸ Ambrose Phillips. *Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester*. (London: J. Roberts, 1723) Act III, p. 32.

¹⁹ Ibid., ActII, p. 26.

²⁰ Ibid., ActIII, p. 43.

²¹ Jean I. Marsden. "Daddy's Girls: Shakespearian Daughters and Eighteenth-Century Ideology." *Shakespeare Survey* 51: (1998): 26.

²² Aaron Hill. *King Henry V*. (London: W. Chetwood, 1723) Act III, p. 30.

²³ Ibid., ActIII, p. 35.

²⁴ Ambrose Phillips. *Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester*. (London: J. Roberts, 1723) Act I, p. 15.

²⁵ Theophilus Cibber. *King Henry VI*. (London: W. Chetwood, 1724) Act III, p. 37.

²⁶ See Jean I. Marsden. "Re-written Women: Shakespearean Heroines in the Restoration." *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth*. Ed. Jean I. Marsden. (Hemel Hempsted: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991) 43. Marsden does not acknowledge that the point of dressing women in trousers is to show off the thigh through the tight garment. Cross-dressing is hardly necessary merely to display a woman's ankles.

²⁷ Aaron Hill. *King Henry V*. (London: W. Chetwood, 1723) Act IV, p. 41.

²⁸ Ibid., ActV, p. 53.

²⁹ Ambrose Phillips. *Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester*. (London: J. Roberts, 1723) Act II, p. 26).

³⁰ Ibid., ActV, pp. 81–82.

³¹ Marsden contradicts this assertion, claiming that Shakespeare's original women are rarely meek or passive and often monstrosities, but that this is not true of female characters in the adaptations. See Jean I. Marsden. "Re-written Women: Shakespearean Heroines in the

Restoration." *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth*. Ed. Jean I. Marsden. (Hemel Hempsted: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991) 46.

³² Ibid., p. 46.

³³ Ibid., pp. 47–48.

³⁴ Anon. "To Mr Philips, on his Humphrey Duke of Gloucester; by a Gentleman of the House of Commons." *The British Journal* XXV: 2–3: 1723: 2–3. This is again contrary to Marsden's argument which claims that women who participate in the political realm face scathing criticism. See Jean I. Marsden. "Daddy's Girls: Shakespearian Daughters and Eighteenth-Century Ideology," *Shakespeare Survey* 51: (1998): 20.

³⁵ Jean I. Marsden. "Daddy's Girls: Shakespearian Daughters and Eighteenth-Century Ideology." *Shakespeare Survey* 51: (1998): 20.

³⁶ Jean I. Marsden. "Female Spectatorship, Jeremy Collier and the Anti-Theatrical Debate," *ELH* 65: (1998): 877.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 879.

³⁸ Ibid., pp. 886–887.

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 886–887.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 884.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 884.

⁴² Ambrose Phillips. *Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester*. (London: J. Roberts, 1723) Act I, pp. 12–13.

⁴³ Brean S. Hammond. *Pope and Bolingbroke: A Study of Friendship and Influence*. (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984) 156.